



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV256034425US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief – Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: August 29, 2003

Signature:

Gail Miller
(Gail L. Miller)

Docket No.: 47524/P069D2/10015700
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Michael J. Polcyn

Application No.: 09/574,317

Group Art Unit: 2642

Filed: May 19, 2000

Examiner: B. Bui

For: ONE NUMBER LAN BASED CALENDAR

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

RECEIVED

SEP 03 2003

Technology Center 2600

MS Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Supplemental Brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on June 28, 2002 and the Appellant's Brief filed on August 28, 2002. This Supplemental Brief is also filed in response to an Office Action mailed on November 20, 2002, reopening prosecution of this case and withdrawing allowance of claims 15 and 17-20 and an Office Action mailed May 29, 2003 sustaining those rejections in the face of Appellant's arguments.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.193(b)(2) no fees are necessitated by this supplemental brief.

This supplemental brief is transmitted in triplicate.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.192 and M.P.E.P. §1206:

- I. Real Party In Interest
- II. Related Appeals and Interferences
- III. Status of Claims
- IV. Status of Amendments
- V. Summary of Invention
- VI. Issues
- VII. Grouping of Claims
- VIII. Arguments
- IX. Claims Involved in the Appeal

Appendix A Claims

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

InterVoice Limited Partnership, a Nevada limited partnership with a principal place of business at 639 Isbell Road, Reno, Nevada.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 19 claims pending in the present application identified as claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20.

B. Current Status of Claims

- 1. Claim canceled: 16
- 2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
- 3. Claims pending: 1-15 and 17-20
- 4. Claims allowed: None
- 5. Claims rejected: 1-15 and 17-20
- 6. Claims objected to: None

C. Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The present application was filed on May 19, 2000 as a divisional of commonly assigned U. S. Pat. No. 6,058,415, application serial number 08/899,953, filed July 24, 1997, entitled "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR INTEGRATION OF COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS WITH COMPUTER-BASED INFORMATION SYSTEMS," priority to which filing date was claimed through related commonly assigned and co-pending United States patent application serial number 09/528,816 filed March 20, 2000, entitled "ONE NUMBER LAN BASED CALENDAR".

Claims 1 through 20 were originally presented in the application filed on May 19, 2000. An Office Action mailed on November 20, 2000 rejected claims 1 through 20 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by King *et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,841 (hereinafter, *King*). Appellant filed a Response, which did not amend the claims, on February 14, 2001, received by the United States Patent Office on February 20, 2001. The Response presented arguments as to the patentability of all claims.

A (First) Final Office Action, once again rejecting claims 1 through 20 as being anticipated by *King*, was mailed on May 4, 2001. In response Appellant submitted an Amendment After Final Rejection dated July 26, 2001, which was received by the United States Patent Office on July 30, 2001. The Amendment After Final Rejection presented arguments as to the improper finality of the subject Final Office Action, pointed out the patentability of all claims, and amended the first paragraph of the application to clarify the claim of priority in the present application.

A non-final Office Action was mailed on August 29, 2001, rejecting claims 1 through 20 as being anticipated by Brennan *et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 5,329,578 (hereinafter, *Brennan*). In Response Appellant filed an Amendment on November 19, 2001, which was received by the Office on January 2, 2002, amending claims 8 and 15 and canceling claim 16. This Amendment also pointed out the patentability of claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20.

A (Second) Final Office Action was mailed on April 1, 2002, allowing claim 15 and claims 17 through 20 while finally rejecting claims 1 through 14 as being anticipated by *Brennan*. Appellant has not filed an Amendment After Final Rejection in response to the

Final Office Action dated April 1, 2002. However, Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on June 28, 2002, which was received by the United States Patent Office on July 8, 2002. Therein, Appellant appealed the final rejection of claims 1 through 14 and a subsequent Appeal Brief was filed on August 28, 2002.

In an Office Action dated November 20, 2002, prosecution of the present application was reopened, the indication of allowability of claims 15 and 17 through 20 was withdrawn and claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Arbel et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 (*Arbel*). Appellant filed a Response to this Office Action on February 18, 2003 in which Appellant pointed out the Novelty and non-obviousness of the pending claims in contrast to the teachings of the cited reference, *Arbel*.

In an Office Action dated May 29, 2003 a provisional double patenting rejection of claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20 over claims 1-20 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/528, 816 was advanced for the first time. The rejection of claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20 as anticipated by *Arbel* was reiterated in this Office Action as well. In response to the double patenting rejection, Appellant files herewith a terminal disclaimer disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/528,816. In response to the reiteration of the anticipation rejection under *Arbel*, Appellant presents the accompanying Request for Reinstatement of Appeal and this Supplemental Brief.

V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

As discussed beginning on page 9, line 3, of the specification of the present application, system 10 for completing calls from a calling party directed to a particular called party comprises calendar information 104 with respect to the called party stored in a general purpose processor-based system, such as in database 101. System 10 further comprises means 105 for providing select portions of the calendar information to automatic call routing system 107, wherein a call routing scheme of the call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of the select portions of the calendar information. Specifically, see the paragraph beginning on page 10, line 23.

A method for completing calls from a calling party directed to a particular called party is also discussed beginning on page 9, line 3, of the specification. This method comprises storing calendar information including specific events scheduled with respect to the called party on a general purpose processor-based system. The method also comprises, as discussed beginning with the paragraph at page 10, line 23, providing select portions of the calendar information to an automatic call routing system, wherein a call routing scheme of the call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of the select portions of the calendar information.

The calendar information may comprise data file 104 associated with a electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer. Beginning on page 11 of the specification alternative automatic operation of the providing means is discussed. This automatic operation may be initiated upon modification of the calendar information stored on the general purpose processor-based system. Alternatively, as discussed at line 6 of page 11 this automatic operation of the providing means may be initiated at a pre-selected time interval. The present system or method may also include, as discussed beginning on line 20 of page 11, gleaned the select portions of the calendar information from a data file stored on the general purpose processor-based system and manipulating the gleaned information to provide the calendar information in a format suitable for augmentation into call routing information of the call routing system. Finally, as discussed beginning on page 21, line 21, the present system or method may also include means for selectively disseminating at least a portion of the calendar information through the call routing system, wherein the disseminated calendar information results in a humanly perceptible reproduction of the at least a portion of the calendar information.

VI. ISSUES

Whether claims 1-15 and 17-20 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), by Arbel *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 (*Arbel*).

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For purposes of this appeal brief only, and without conceding the teachings of any prior art reference, the claims have been grouped as indicated below:

| Group | Claim |
|--------------|--------------|
| I. | Claim 1 |
| II. | Claim 8 |
| III. | Claim 15 |
| IV. | Claim 2 |
| V. | Claim 9 |
| VI. | Claim 3 |
| VII. | Claim 10 |
| VIII. | Claim 17 |
| IX. | Claim 4 |
| X. | Claim 11 |
| XI. | Claim 18 |
| XII. | Claim 5 |
| XIII. | Claim 12 |
| XIV. | Claim 19 |
| XV. | Claim 6 |
| XVI. | Claim 13 |
| XVII. | Claim 20 |
| XVIII. | Claim 7 |
| XIX. | Claim 14 |

The claims do not stand or fall together. In Section VIII below, Appellant has included arguments supporting the separate patentability of each claim group as required by M.P.E.P. §1206.

VIII. ARGUMENTS

As required by 37 CFR §1.192(8)(iii), for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, the below-advanced arguments specify the errors in the rejection and why the rejected claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102, including any specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied upon in the rejection.

Claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Arbel *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 (hereinafter, *Arbel*). Appellant respectfully traverses the rejections of record and respectfully requests reversal and an indication of allowability of claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20 by the Board.

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. §2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. §102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required

by the claim,” see M.P.E.P. §2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. §102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” see M.P.E.P. §2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Appellant respectfully asserts that the rejection does not satisfy at least these requirements.

A. The Claim of Group I (claim 1)

Appellant respectfully asserts that the “time and date conditions” of *Arbel* (column 13, line 4) do not meet the recited “calendaring information” of independent claim 1. *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary* defines “calendar” as “3. A list or register, esp. one arranged chronologically, as of appointments, work to be done, or cases to be tried in a court”, 1996, p. 296 (earlier submitted as Exhibit 1 (copy attached) in the “original” Appeal Brief). Consistent with this definition, the present specification teaches that a preferred embodiment of the invention uses a calendar stored on a personal computer or personal digital assistant showing specific events scheduled for a particular day by a user, see page 9, lines 24-26.

In addressing this aspect of the claims, the current Office Action relies upon database 360. However, in contrast to the recited calendaring information of claim 1, *Arbel* recites the use of “predetermined selection criteria” such as “call origination information, call origination information with wildcards, time, day, date, or a combination of the above factors” (column 5, line 8). Appellant respectfully asserts that the time, day and date information of *Arbel*, cited by the current Office Action, does not meet the recited “calendaring information with respect to said called party” The time, day and date information of *Arbel* only defines “predetermined selection criteria” for routing calls (column 5, line 7), as highlighted in the table shown at line 20 of column 10 which only shows times, days and call transfer numbers. This “predetermined selection criteria” does not comprise a calendar for the called party showing specific events scheduled for a particular day by a user. For at least these reasons Appellant contends that the “calendaring information” recited by claim 1 is not taught by *Arbel*.

The May 29, 2003 Office Action states:

“As to point (1), it is well known that a calendar includes year, month, date and day. Any specific year, month, date or day allocated for a desired event is considered as calendaring information. Table shown at line 20 (sic) of column 10 in *Arbel* reads on the “calendaring information” based on this sense.” (emphasis added)

However, as pointed out above the present specification indicates that calendaring information includes specific events scheduled for a particular day by a user. This is not taught by the cited table of *Arbel*, which only shows times, days and target numbers to transfer calls. Events as discussed in the present specification or even the year, month or date mentioned in the Office Action are absent from this table.

Independent claim 1 also recites “calendaring information...stored on a general purpose processor-based system”. *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary* defines “general purpose” as “useful in many ways; not limited in use or function”, 1996, p. 795 (earlier submitted as Exhibit 2 (copy attached) in the “original” Appeal Brief). Conversely, *Arbel* only discloses a controller 370 as part of system 140. System 140’s sole disclosed function is to interact with IVDT 130 (column 6, line 33). Although it is indicated that controller 370 “May be a microprocessor such as an IBM PS/2 personal computer which is manufactured by International Business Machines Corporation” (column 7, line 38), there is no suggestion that system 140 or controller 370 of *Arbel* is configured for anything other than special purpose use to control IVDT 130. For at least these reasons Appellant contends that the “general purpose processor-base system” recited by claim 1 is not taught by *Arbel*.

Claim 1 also recites “means for providing select portions of said calendaring information to an automatic call routing system, wherein a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information”. (Emphasis added.) The Board’s attention is directed to the specification at page 9, lines 24-26, wherein a personal computer or personal digital assistant is taught to store a personal calendar which may include a schedule of specific events for user for a particular day. A preferred embodiment of the present invention is taught to extract specific information from the calendar information with respect to events scheduled for the user to present information to an automatic call routing system, page 10, lines 4-10. Parameters of the call routing system are modified to ensure the call routing applications route calls according to the provided information, page 10, lines 25-27.

The May 29, 2003 Office Action states:

“Arbel also teaches database 360 provides the automatic call routing system 140 the information of how (when and where) to route calls (see col. 12, lns 7-19).”

However, at column 12, lines 14-19 *Arbel* only teaches that “controller 370 compares the call origination information with the predetermined selection criteria which are stored in the database to determine the proper course of action, i.e., to determine whether to provide a message, to accept or block the call, or to re-route the call.” Further, *Arbel* only teaches that “Specifically, a user sends a message to system 140 that information is to be added, deleted, or changed in database 360 pertaining to sending messages, screening, or re-routing calls by interacting with IVDT 130” (column 10, line 44). Accordingly, *Arbel* fails to disclose “providing select portions of calendaring information to an automatic call routing system” as recited in claim 1. *Arbel* only teaches the controller comparing call origination information with database contents to determine a course of action or a user sending a message to change information concerning call routing; not “providing select portions of said calendaring information to an automatic call routing system,” particularly where “a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information.”

Finally, *Arbel* fails to disclose “a call routing scheme... modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information” (emphasis added). In contrast, *Arbel* uses the “predetermined selection criteria” to determine operation of the call routing system. Specifically, at column 12, line 15 *Arbel* provides “Then, controller 370 compares the call origination information with the predetermined selection criteria which are stored in the database to determine the proper course of action, i.e., to determine whether to provide a message, to accept or block the call, or to re-route the call.”. There is no disclosure in *Arbel* of the claimed modification to the call routing system as a function of a portion calendaring information. *Arbel* uses the “predetermined selection criteria” to route a call, not portions of a user’s calendar. For at least these reasons Appellant contends that the “call routing scheme... modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information” recited by claim 1 is not taught by *Arbel*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claim 1 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, whereas claims 2 through 7 ultimately depend from base claim 1, and thus each inherit all limitations of claim 1, claims 2 through 7 set forth features and limitations not recited by *Arbel*. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 1 through 7 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

B. The Claim of Group II (claim 8)

Similar to claim 1, claim 8 recites “calendaring information...stored on a general purpose processor-based system”; and “providing select portions of said calendaring information to an automatic call routing system, wherein a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information”. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Arbel* fails to disclose these limitations.

Additionally, independent claim 8 recites “storing calendaring information including specific events scheduled with respect to said called party ...” (Emphasis added.) The current Office Action fails to address the emphasized element. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record of claim 8, and the rejection of claims 9 through 4 ultimately depending therefrom, is improper.

However, the May 29, 2003 Office Action does state:

“Arbel teaches the database 360 for storing calendaring information shown in a table at line 20 (sic) of column 10 including specific events scheduled such as when and where calls should be routed with respect to a called party (see col. 12, Ins 7-19).”

Regardless, Appellant respectfully asserts that the “predetermined selection criteria” of *Arbel* does not meet the “storing calendaring information including specific events scheduled with respect to said called party” limitations of claim 8. *Arbel* fails to disclose storing of specific events in the table at line 20 of column 10. Particularly, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the “predetermined selection criteria” of *Arbel*, such as “call

origination information, call origination information with wildcards, time, day, date, or a combination of the above factors” (column 5, line 8), does not meet the recited “calendar information”, much less the inclusion of specific events in such calendar information. The time, day and date information of *Arbel* only defines “predetermined selection criteria” for routing calls (column 5, line 7), as highlighted in the table shown at line 20 of column 10 which only shows times, days and call transfer numbers.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of claim 8 is incomplete, and thus improper. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claim 8, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, whereas claims 9 through 14 ultimately depend from base claim 8, and thus each inherit all limitations of claim 8, claims 9 through 14 set forth features and limitations not recited by *Arbel*. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 8 through 14 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

C. The Claims of Group III (claim 15)

Claim 15 recites “calendar information with respect to said called party stored in a data format operable with a processor-based system, wherein said calendar information comprises a data file associated with a electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer”. As pointed out above with respect to independent claims 1 and 8, the “predetermined selection criteria”, such as time, day and date information, does not meet “calendar information” such as recited in claim 15. Also as discussed above, *Arbel* fails to disclose providing portions of the calendar information to the call routing system or managing operation of the call routing system as a function of the portions of the calendar information. *Arbel* only provides for direct entry of all of the “predetermined selection criteria” by a user. At column 10, line 44 *Arbel* states: “Specifically, a user sends a message to system 140 that information is to be added, deleted, or changed in database 360 pertaining to sending messages, screening, or re-routing calls by interacting with IVDT 130.”

Furthermore, *Arbel* is silent as to a “data file” associated with an electronic “calendar program” or the like. However, the May 29, 2003 Office Action states:

“Arbel’s reference should be read in light of the level of skill in the art that the recited table is inherently stored in the database 360 in the form of data file for fast and conveniently retrieving when needed.”

Appellant respectfully contends that this statement by the Office Action improperly states the test for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). As pointed out above, M.P.E.P. §2131 provides that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of claim 1

5, and the rejection of claims 17 through 20 ultimately depending therefrom, is incomplete and improper . Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claim 15 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, whereas claims 17 through 20 ultimately depend from base claim 15, and thus each inherit all limitations of claim 15, claims 17 through 20 set forth features and limitations not recited by *Arbel*. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 15 and 17 through 20 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

D. The Claims of Group IV (claim 2) and Group V (claim 9)

Dependent claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. As shown above, base claims 1 and 8, from which these claims 2 and 9 respectively depend, recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2 and 9 are each separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective independent base claims for the separate reasons discussed above.

Moreover, dependent claims 2 and 9 recite limitations not found in the applied art, namely, the “calendar information comprises a data file associated with an electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer”. The Office Action fails to specifically address this element. Furthermore, as discussed above in relation to claim 15, *Arbel* is silent

as to a “data file” associated with an electronic “calendar program” or the like. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the anticipation rejections of claims 2 and 9 are improper and that claims 2 and 9 are not anticipated by *Arbel*, as *Arbel* fails to disclose a “data file” associated with an electronic “calendar program”. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 2 and 9 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

E. The Claims of Group VI (claim 3), Group VII (claim 10) and Group VIII (claim 17)

Dependent claims 3, 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. As shown above, the base claims from which each of these claims depend recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Dependent claim 3 depends directly from claim 1. Claim 10 depends directly from claim 8. Claim 17 depends directly from claim 15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3, 10 and 17 are each separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective independent base claims for the separate reasons discussed above in respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Furthermore, claims 3, 10 and 17 recite limitations for providing the select portions of the calendaring information to the call routing system automatically. *Arbel* does not teach the automatic provision of calendaring information to a call routing system as recited in claims 3, 10 and 17. For example, the portion of *Arbel* relied upon by the current Office Action in meeting these claims teaches, in part that:

“In particular, when an incoming call is received by IVDT 130...Controller 370 interrogates database 360 using the call origination information as a retrieval key. Then, controller 370 compares the call origination information with the predetermined selection criteria which are stored in the database to determine the proper course of action, *i.e.*, to determine whether to provide a message, to accept or block the call, or to re-route the call.”

Thus, *Arbel* fails to disclose any sort of automatic provisioning of calendar information. The “predetermined selection criteria” of *Arbel* are retrieved in response to an incoming call based on the caller’s number. For at least these reasons Appellant contends that the limitations recited by claims 3, 10 and 17 for providing the select portions of the calendaring information to the call routing system automatically are not taught by *Arbel*.

Additionally, claims 4 and 5 depend directly from claim 3; claims 11 and 12 depend directly from claim 10; and claims 18 and 19 depend directly from claim 17. Thus, each of claims, 4, 5, 11, 12, 18 and 19, separately inherits all limitations of its respective base claims. Thus, claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18 and 19 separately set forth features and limitations not recited by *Arbel*. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the reasons advanced above claims 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 18 and 19 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of record.

F. The Claims of Group IX (claim 4), Group X (claim 11) and Group XI (claim 18)

Dependent claims 4, 11 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. As shown above, each of the independent claims, claims 1, 8 and 15, from which each of these claims ultimately respectively depend recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Furthermore, as discussed above, claim 4 depends directly from claim 3, claim 11 depends directly from claim 10 and claim 18 depends directly from claim 17. Claims 3, 10 and 17 have been shown immediately above to independently have limitations not taught by *Arbel*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4, 11 and 18 are each separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective base claims, for the reasons discussed above.

In part claim 4 recites “automatic operation of said providing means is initiated upon modification of said calendaring information stored on said general purpose processor-based system”. Claims 11 and 18 define similar limitations. On page 4 of the current Office Action, in its rejection of claim 4, which is relied upon in rejecting claims 11 and 18 as well, the Office Action provides that *Arbel* teaches automatic operation of the database is initiated upon modification of the information stored on the database. This statement by the Office Action is circular in nature and fails to point out teaches of *Arbel* concerning “automatic operation” or initiation of such automatic operation upon modification of calendaring information. In any event, Appellant respectfully contends that these limitations are not taught by *Arbel*. As discussed above in relation to claims 1, 8 and 15, *Arbel* uses directly entered “predetermined selection criteria” to define operation of the call routing system, and there is no disclosure in *Arbel* of initiating automatic provision of select portions of the

calendar information to the call routing system, much less for such provisioning to occur upon modification of the calendar information.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claims 4, 11 and 18 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 4, 11 and 18 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

G. The Claims of Group XII (claim 5), Group XIII (claim 12) and Group XIV (claim 19)

Dependent claims 5, 12 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. As shown above, the independent claims from which each of these claims ultimately depend, claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Additionally, Dependent claim 5 depends directly from claim 3; claim 12 depends directly from claim 10 and claim 19 depends directly from claim 17. Claims 3, 10 and 17 have been shown above to separately have limitations not taught by *Arbel*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective base claims for the reasons discussed above.

Moreover, claims 5, 12 and 19 recite the aforementioned automatic providing being “initiated at a preselected time interval.” This limitation is not taught by *Arbel*. *Arbel* provides at column 10, line 44 “Specifically, a user sends a message to system 140 that information is to be added, deleted, or changed in database 360 pertaining to sending messages, screening, or re-routing calls by interacting with IVDT 130”. At column 12, line 14, *Arbel* provides “then, controller 370 compares the call origination information with the predetermined selection criteria which are stored in the database to determine the proper course of action, *i.e.*, to determine whether to provide a message, to accept or block the call, or to re-route the call”. Thus, there is no disclosure in *Arbel* of initiating provision of select portions of the calendar information to the call routing system automatically, much less for such provisioning to occur at a preselected time interval.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claims 5, 12 and 19 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for the above-advanced reasons claims 5, 12 and 19 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of record.

H. The Claims of Group XV (claim 6), Group XVI (claim 13), and Group XVII (claim 20)

Dependent claims 6, 13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. Dependent claim 6 depends directly from claim 1; claim 13 depends directly from claim 8; and claim 20 depends directly from claim 15. As shown above, the independent base claims from which these claims depend each separately recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are each separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective independent base claims for the reasons discussed above in relation to independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Claims 6, 13 and 20 recite limitations concerning gleaning the select portions of the calendaring information from a data file and manipulating the gleaned information to provide the calendaring information in a format suitable for augmentation into call routing information of the call routing system. In rejecting these claims the current Office Action fails to point out where *Arbel* teaches any sort of gleaning. Thus the rejection of claims 6, 13 and 20 is improper. Regardless, *Arbel* only teaches the use of the “predetermined selection criteria” to determine a course of action (column 12, line 14). *Arbel* is silent as to any gleaning of information. To address the “manipulating” limitation of claims 6, 13 and 20 the Office Action cites “computer keyboard or telephone dialpad of the “IVDT 130” associated with the user. These components are clearly indicated as means for entering the “predetermined selection criteria” in *Arbel*.

Therefore, *Arbel* fails to teach gleaning or manipulating calendar information for use by a call routing system, much less gleaning and manipulating calendar information for use by a call routing system. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel*

does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claims 5, 12 and 19 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C.

§102. Furthermore, whereas claim 7 depends directly from claim 6, and claim 14 depends directly from claim 13, claims 7 and 14 each separately inherits all limitations of its respective base claim. Thus claims 7 and 14 separately set forth features and limitations not recited by *Arbel*. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for these reasons claims 6, 7, 13, 14 and 20 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of record.

I. The Claims of Group XVIII (claim 7) and Group XIX (claim 14)

Dependent claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Arbel*. As shown above, the independent claims from which these claims ultimately depend, claims 1 and 8, respectively, recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by the disclosure of *Arbel*. Additionally, claim 7 depends directly from claim 6, and claim 14 depends directly from claim 13, which have been shown immediately above to separately have limitations not taught by *Arbel*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 14 are separately allowable at least for their dependency from their respective base claims for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 7 and 14 recite “disseminating at least a portion of said calendaring information through said call routing system, wherein said disseminated calendaring information results in a humanly perceptible reproduction of said at least a portion of said calendaring information”. This limitation is not taught by *Arbel*. In its rejection of claims 7 and 14 the Office Action states:

“Arbel et al. further teach the providing means further comprises means for selectively disseminating (deleting or changing) at least a portion of said calendaring information (time of day and certain dates) through said call routing system (“SYSTEM 140”) wherein said disseminated calendaring information (deleting or changing time of day and dates) results in a humanly (user associated with the “IVDT 130”) perceptible reproduction (user of said at least a portion of said calendaring information (column 10, lines 41-68))”.

Appellant finds this rejection inparsable. The portion of *Arbel* cited by the Office Action relates to adding, changing, or deleting “predetermined selection criteria” and is silent as to disseminating information. Further, a search of *Arbel* fails to disclose any sort of dissemination of the “predetermined selection criteria” or any other data.

The recitation of the Office Action does not meet the limitations of base claims 6 and 13, much less disseminating a portion of the calendaring information through said call routing system in a humanly perceptible reproduction of the calendaring information as claimed in claims 7 and 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the disclosure of *Arbel* does not meet the claim language and does not show the identical invention in as complete of detail as recited in claims 7 and 14 as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Appellant respectfully asserts that at least for these reasons claims 7 and 14 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of record.

J. Conclusion

As shown above, there are great differences between the claims and the prior art. Moreover a person of ordinary skill in the art considering the prior art would not find these differences obvious. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully traverses the current Office Action 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of record. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board indicate allowability of claims 1 through 15 and 17 through 20.

IX. CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A. The claims in Appendix A include amendments, filed by Appellant on July 26, 2001 and November 19, 2001, and entered by the Office.

Appellant believes no fee is due with this Supplemental Appeal Brief or the accompanying Request for Reinstatement of Appeal. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 47524/P069D2/10015700 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 29, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jerry L. Mahurin

Registration No.: 34,661

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-2784

(214) 855-8000

(214) 855-8200 (Fax)

Attorneys for Appellant

APPENDIX A

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/574,317:

1. A system for completing calls from a calling party directed to a particular called party, said system comprising:
 calendar information with respect to said called party stored on a general purpose processor-based system; and
 means for providing select portions of said calendar information to an automatic call routing system, wherein a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendar information.
2. The system of claim 1, wherein said calendar information comprises a data file associated with a electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer.
3. The system of claim 1, wherein said providing means is operable automatically.
4. The system of claim 3, wherein said automatic operation of said providing means is initiated upon modification of said calendar information stored on said general purpose processor-based system.
5. The system of claim 3, wherein said automatic operation of said providing means is initiated at a preselected time interval.
6. The system of claim 1, wherein said providing means comprises:
 means for gleaned said select portions of said calendar information from a data file stored on said general purpose processor-based system; and
 means for manipulating said gleaned information to provide said calendar information in a format suitable for augmentation into call routing information of said call routing system.

7. The system of claim 6, wherein said providing means further comprises:
means for selectively disseminating at least a portion of said calendaring information through said call routing system, wherein said disseminated calendaring information results in a humanly perceptible reproduction of said at least a portion of said calendaring information.

8. A method for completing calls from a calling party directed to a particular called party comprising:
storing calendaring information including specific events scheduled with respect to said called party on a general purpose processor-based system; and
providing select portions of said calendaring information to an automatic call routing system, wherein a call routing scheme of said call routing system is modified to route calls as a function of said select portions of said calendaring information.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein said calendaring information comprises a data file associated with a electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer.

10. The method of claim 8, wherein said providing step is operable automatically.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein said automatic operation of said providing step is initiated upon modification of said calendaring information stored on said general purpose processor-based system.

12. The method of claim 10, wherein said automatic operation of said providing step is initiated at a preselected time interval.

13. The method of claim 8, wherein said providing step comprises:
gleaning said select portions of said calendaring information from a data file stored on said general purpose processor-based system; and
manipulating said gleaned information to provide said calendaring information in a format suitable for augmentation into call routing information of said call routing system.

14. The method of claim 13, wherein said providing step further comprises: disseminating at least a portion of said calendaring information through said call routing system, wherein said disseminated calendaring information results in a humanly perceptible reproduction of said at least a portion of said calendaring information.

15. A system for completing calls from a calling party to a called party, said system comprising:
calendaring information with respect to said called party stored in a data format operable with a processor-based system, wherein said calendaring information comprises a data file associated with a electronic calendar program operable on a personal computer; and
a processor-based system in communication with said calendaring information and a call routing system, wherein said processor-based system operates under control of an algorithm to provide portions of said calendaring information to said call routing system and thereby modify operation of said call routing system to route calls as a function of said portions of said calendaring information.

17. The system of claim 15, wherein said algorithm provides said portions of said calendaring information to said call routing system automatically.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein said automatic operation provided by said algorithm is initiated upon modification of said calendaring information.

19. The system of claim 17, wherein said automatic operation provided by said algorithm is initiated at a preselected time interval.

20. The system of claim 15, wherein said processor-based system operating under control of said algorithm gleans said select portions of said calendaring information from a data file, and manipulates said gleaned information to provide said calendaring information in a format suitable for augmentation into call routing information of said call routing system.

Acknowledgments and Permissions

The "A Dictionary of the English Language" section of this book (*Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary*) is based on the second edition of *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, the Unabridged Edition*, copyright 1993, 1987.

First published in 2001 by
Thunder Bay Press

An imprint of the Advantage Publishers Group
5880 Oberlin Drive, San Diego, CA 92121-4794
www.advantagebooksonline.com

Copyright © 1996 by Random House Value Publishing, Inc.

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American
Copyright Conventions.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

All notations of errors or omissions should be addressed to Thunder Bay Press, editorial department, at the above address. All other correspondence (author inquires, permissions) concerning the content of this book should be addressed to Random House Value Publishing, a division of Random House, Inc. 280 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017.
<http://www.randomhouse.com/>

ISBN 1-57145-691-0

Printed and bound in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5

cal-cu-lous (kal'kyə ləs), *adj.* *Pathol.* Characterized by the presence of calculus, or stone. [1400-50; late ME *calculus*, full of stones < L *calculus*, equiv. to *calcu-* (us) small stone (see *CALCULUS*) + *-lous* -ous]

cal-cu-lus (kal'kyə ləs), *n.*, *pl.* -li (-li/), -lus-es. 1. *Math.* a method of calculation, esp. one of several highly systematic methods of treating problems by a special system of algebraic notations, as differential or integral calculus. 2. *Pathol.* a stone, or concretion, formed in the gallbladder, kidneys, or other parts of the body. 3. Also called *tartar*. *Dentistry*, a hard, yellowish to brownish-black deposit on teeth formed largely through the mineralization of dead bacteria in dental plaques by the calcium salts in salivary secretions and subgingival transudates. [1610-20; < L *calculus*, small stone (used in reckoning), equiv. to *calc-* (s. of *calc* stone) + *-ulus* -ule]

cal/culus of fi/nite differences, the branch of mathematics dealing with the application of techniques similar to those of differential and integral calculus to discrete rather than continuous quantities.

cal/culus of pleas/ure. See *hedonic calculus*.

cal/culus of varia/tions, the branch of mathematics that deals with the problem of finding a curve or surface that maximizes or minimizes a given expression, usually with several restrictions placed on the desired curve. [1830-40]

Cal-cut-ta (kal kut'ə), *n.* 1. a seaport in and the capital of West Bengal state, in E India, on the Hooghly River; former capital of British India. 7,031,382. 2. (sometimes *l.c.*) Also called *Calcutta pool*, a form of betting pool for a competition or tournament, as golf or auto racing, in which gamblers bid for participating contestants in an auction, the proceeds from which are put into a pool for distribution, according to a prearranged scale of percentages, to those who selected winners.

cal-dar-i-um (kal dār'ē əm), *n.*, *pl.* -dar-ia (-dār'ē ə). (in an ancient Roman bath) a room having a hot bath. [1745-55; < L *n.* use of neut. of *caldarius* of warming, equiv. to *cal(i)d(us)* warm (*cal(ēre)* to be warm + *-idus* -id) + *-arius* -ary; see *-ium*, -arium]

Cal/de-cott award (kōl'di kōt), an annual award in the U.S. for an outstanding illustrated juvenile book. [named after Randolph Caldecott (1846-86), English illustrator]

Cal-der (kōl'dər), *n.* Alexander. 1898-1976, U.S. sculptor; originator of mobiles.

cal-de-ra (kal der'ə, kōl-), *n.* a large, basinlike depression resulting from the explosion or collapse of the center of a volcano. [1860-65; < Sp *Caldera*, name of a crater on Canary Islands, lit., cauldron < LL *caldaria*, *n.* use of fem. of *caldarius* of warming; see *CALDARIUM*]

Cal-de-rón de la Bar-ca (kāl'də rōn' de la bār'kə; Sp. kál'də rōn' de la bār'kə), *Pedro* (pā'drō, ped'rō; Sp. pe'thro), 1600-81, Spanish dramatist and poet.

cal-dron (kōl'drən), *n.* cauldron.

Cald-well (kōld'wel, -wəl), *n.* 1. Erskine, born 1903, U.S. novelist. 2. Sarah, born 1924, U.S. conductor and opera producer. 3. a city in W Idaho. 17,699.

Cal-eb (kā'leb), *n.* 1. a Hebrew leader, sent as a spy into the land of Canaan. Num. 13:6. 2. a male given name: from a Hebrew word meaning "dog."

Cal-eb-ite (kā'le bit'), *n.* 1. a member of a tribe descended from Caleb. —*adj.* 2. of or pertaining to the Calebites. [CALEB + -ite]

cal-èche (Fr. *ka lēsh'*; Eng. *ka lēsh'*), *n.*, *pl.* -lèches (Fr. -lēsh'; Eng. -lēsh'əz). 1. Also, *calash*. (esp. in Quebec, Canada) a type of calash pulled by a single horse, seating two passengers and having two wheels and a folding top. 2. calash (def. 1). [1660-70; < F; see *CALASH*]

Cal-e-don (kal'i dən), *n.* a town in SE Ontario, in S Canada, near Toronto. 26,645.

Cal-e-do-ni-a (kal'i dō'nē ə), *n.* 1. Chiefly *Literary*. Scotland. 2. a female given name.

Cal-e-do-ni-an (kal'i dō'nē ən), *n.* 1. a native or inhabitant of Caledonia. —*adj.* 2. of or pertaining to Caledonia. [1900-05; CALEDONIA + -an]

Caledo'nian Canal, a canal in N Scotland, extending NE from the Atlantic to the North Sea. 60 1/4 mi. (97 km) long.

calef., (in prescriptions) warmed. [< L *calefactus*]

cal-e-fa-cient (kal'ə fā'shənt), *n.* 1. *Med.* a substance, as mustard, that produces a sensation of heat when applied to the body. —*adj.* 2. heating; warming. [1655-65; < L *calefactus* - (s. of *calefactus*, prp. of *calefacere* to make warm), equiv. to *cale-* warm (s. of *calere* to be warm) + *-facient* -facient]

cal-e-fac-tion (kal'ə fā'kshən), *n.* 1. the act of heating. 2. a heated state. [1540-50; < L *calefactio* - (s. of *calefactio*) a making warm, equiv. to *cale-* warm (s. of *calere* to be warm) + *-factio* -a making; see *FACTIO*] —*cal'e-fac'tive*, *adj.*

cal-e-fac-to-ry (kal'ə fā'k'tō rē, -fā'k'trē), *adj.*, *n.*, *pl.* -ries. —*adj.* 1. serving to heat. —*n.* 2. a heated parlor or sitting room in a monastery. [1530-40; < LL *calefactōrius* having a warming or heating power, equiv. to L *calefactus* (see *CALEFACIENT*) + *-ōrius* -ōrius]

cal-en-dar (kal'an dər), *n.* 1. a table or register with the days of each month and week in a year: *He marked the date on his calendar.* 2. any of various systems of reckoning time, esp. with reference to the beginning, length, and divisions of the year. Cf. *Chinese calendar*, *Gregorian calendar*, *Hindu calendar*, *Jewish calendar*.

dar, *Julian calendar*, *Muslim calendar*. 3. a table or register, esp. one arranged chronologically, as of appointments, work to be done, or cases to be tried in a court. 4. a list, in the order to be considered, of bills, resolutions, etc., brought before a legislative body. 5. Obs. a guide or example. —*vt.* 6. to enter in a calendar; register. Also, *calendar*. [1175-1225; ME *calendar* < AF < L *calendārium* account book, equiv. to *Calend(ae)* CALEND (when debts were due) + *-ārium* -ary; see -AR'] —*ca-len-dri-cal* (ka len'dri kal), *ca-len-dric*, *cal-en-dar-i-al* (kal'an dār'ē əl), *cal'en-dar'i-an*, *cal'en-dar'ic*, *adj.*

—*Syn.* 3. diary, schedule, program.

cal/endar art, a type of sentimental, picturesque, or sexually titillating picture used on some calendars.

cal/endar clock, a clock that indicates date of the month, day of the week, etc., as well as the time, and sometimes indicates the phases of the moon and other periodical data. [1880-85]

cal/endar day, the period from one midnight to the following midnight. [1840-50]

cal/endar month, month (def. 1). [1780-90]

cal/endar watch, a watch that indicates date of the month, day of the week, etc., as well as the time.

cal/endar year. See under *year* (def. 1).

cal-en-der (kal'an dər), *n.* 1. a machine in which cloth, paper, or the like, is smoothed, glazed, etc., by pressing between rotating cylinders. 2. a machine for impregnating fabric with rubber, as in the manufacture of automobile tires. —*vt.* 3. to press in a calendar. [1505-15; < MF *calandre*, by vowel assimilation < **colandre* < VL **colendra*, for L *cylindrus* CYLINDER; cf. ME *calender* (< AF) as name of occupation] —*cal'en-der-er*, *n.*

Cal-en-der (kal'an dər), *n.* qalandar.

cal-ends (kal'ənz), *n.* (usually used with a plural *v.*) the first day of the month in the ancient Roman calendar, from which the days of the preceding month were counted backward to the ides. Also, *kalends*. [1325-75; ME *kalends*, alter. (with native pl. suffix) of L *kalendae*, perh. equiv. to *cal* - (base of *calare* to proclaim) + *-end-* formative suffix (perh. for **-and-*) + *-ae* pl. ending]

cal-en-du-la (ka len'djə lə), *n.* 1. Also called *pot marigold*, a composite plant, *Calendula officinalis*, widely cultivated for its showy, many-rayed orange or yellow flower heads. 2. the dried florets of this plant, sometimes used medicinally. 3. any other plant of the genus *Calendula*. [1870-75; < ML, equiv. to L *calend(ae)* CAL-ends + *-ula* -ule]

cal-en-ture (kal'an char, -chōr'), *n.* *Pathol.* a violent fever with delirium, affecting persons in the tropics. [1885-95; earlier *calentura* < Sp; fever, equiv. to *calen-* (to heat) < L *calens*, s. of *calens*, prp. of *calere* to be hot) + *-ura* -ure] —*cal'en-tur'al*, *cal'en-tu'rish*, *adj.*

cal-e-sa (Sp. *kā le'sā*), *n.* (in the Philippines) a small, two-wheeled calash. [< Sp < F *calèche* CALÈCHE]

cal-es-cent (ka les'ənt), *adj.* growing warm; increasing in heat. [1795-1805; < L *calēscens* - (s. of *calēscens* becoming warm, prp. of *calēscere*), equiv. to *cal-* (s. of *calere* to be warm) + *-escens* -escens] —*cal-es-cence*, *n.*

Cal-lex-i-co (ka lek'si kō'), *n.* a town in S California. 14,412.

calf (kaf, käf), *n.*, *pl.* calves (kavz, kävz). 1. the young of the domestic cow or other bovine animal. 2. the young of certain other mammals, as the elephant, seal, and whale. 3. calfskin leather. 4. *Informal*, an awkward, silly boy or man. 5. a mass of ice detached from a glacier, iceberg, or floe. 6. in *calif*, (of a cow or other animal having calves) pregnant. 7. kill the fatted calf, to prepare an elaborate feast in welcome or celebration. [bef. 900; ME: OE *cealf*, *calif*; c. OS *kalif*, ON *kalfr*, OHG *kalb*] —*calf'less*, *adj.* —*calf'like*, *adj.*

calf (OHG *kälf*), *n.*, *pl.* calves (kavz, kävz), the fleshy part of the back of the human leg below the knee. [1275-1325; ME < ON *kalfr*; akin to *CALF*]

calf/love. See *puppy love*. [1815-25]

calf/roping, a timed rodeo event in which a mounted rider chases and lassos a calf, dismounts, and throws the calf to the ground, tying three of the animal's legs with a short length of rope. [1905-10, Amer.]

calf's-foot jell'y (kavz'fōt', kävz'-, kafs'-, käfs'-), jelly made from the stock of boiled calves' [1765-75]

calf-skin (kaf'skin', käf'-), *n.* 1. the skin or hide of a calf. 2. leather made from this skin. [1580-90; CALF + SKIN]

calf's tongue, *Archit.* a molding having pendulous, tongue-like members in relief against a flat or molded surface.

Cal-ga-ry (kal'gə rē), *n.* a city in S Alberta, in SW Canada. 469,917.

Cal/gary red/eye, *Canadian* (chiefly Alberta), a drink consisting of a mixture of beer and tomato juice.

Cal-gon (kal'gon), *Trademark*, a brand of sodium phosphate glass (sodium hexametaphosphate), soluble in water; used as a water-softening agent.

Cal-hoon (kal hōn', kəl-), *n.* John Caldwell, 1780-1850, vice president of the U.S. 1825-32.

Cal-i (kāl'le), *n.* a city in SW Colombia. 898,253.

Cal-i-ban (kal'ə ban'), *n.* the ugly, beastlike slave of Prospero in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.

cal-i-ber (kal'ə bər), *n.* 1. the diameter of something of circular section, esp. that of the inside of a tube: a pipe of three-inch caliber. 2. *Ordn.* the diameter of the bore of a gun taken as a unit of measurement. 3. degree of capacity or competence; ability: a mathematician of high caliber. 4. degree of merit or excellence; quality: the high moral caliber of the era. Also, esp. *Brit.*, *calibre* [1560-70; var. of *calibre* < MF < Ar *qalīb* mold, lit. < Gk *kalāpos* shoe last, equiv. to *kala-* comb. form of *kālon* wood + *pōis* foot (see *-pod*)] —*cal'i-bered*, *adj.* —*cal'i-bred*, *adj.*

—*Syn.* 4. worth, distinction.

cal-i-brate (kal'ə brāt'), *v.t.* -brat-ed, -brating, to determine, check, or rectify the graduation of (any instrument giving quantitative measurements). 2. to divide or mark with gradations, graduations, or other indexes of degree, quantity, etc., as on a thermometer, measuring cup, or the like. 3. to determine the correct range for (an artillery gun, mortar, etc.) by observing where the fired projectile hits. 4. to plan or devise (something) carefully so as to have a precise use, application, appeal, etc.: a sales strategy calibrated to rich investors. [1860-65; CALIBER + -ATE'] —*cal'i-brat'ed*, *adj.* —*cal'i-brat'or*, *cal'i-brat'er*, *n.*

cal-i-ces (kal'ə sēz'), *n.* *pl.* of *calix*.

cal-i-che (ka lē'chē), *n.* *Geol.* 1. a surface deposit consisting of sand or clay impregnated with crystalline salts, such as sodium nitrate or sodium chloride. 2. a zone of calcium carbonate or other carbonates in soils of semi-arid regions. Cf. *duricrust*, *hardpan*. [1855-60; < Sp. *caliche*, equiv. to *cal* lime (< L *calc-*; see *CHALK*) + *-iche* *n.* suffix]

cal-i-cle (kal'i kəl), *n.* 1. a cuplike depression or indentation, as in corals. 2. *Bot.*, *Zool.* calyculus. [1840-50; < L *caliculus* small cup, equiv. to *calic-* (s. of *calix* < CALIX) cup + *-ulus* -ule]

cal-i-co (kal'i kō'), *n.*, *pl.* -coes, -cos, *adj.* —*n.* 1. a plain-woven cotton cloth printed with a figured pattern, usually on one side. 2. *Brit.* plain white cotton cloth. 3. an animal having a spotted or particolored coat. 4. Obs. a figured cotton cloth from India. —*adj.* 5. made of calico. 6. resembling printed calico; spotted or mottled. [1495-1505; short for *Calico cloth*, var. of *Calicut cloth* named after city in India which orig. exported it]

cal-i-co-back (kal'i kō bak'), *n.* See *harlequin bug*. [1870-75, Amer.]

cal/i-co bass (bas), the black crappie. See under *crappie*. [1880-85, Amer.]

cal/i-co bug. See *harlequin bug*. [1885-90, Amer.]

cal/i-co bush. See *mountain laurel*. [1805-10, Amer.]

cal/i-co cat, a domestic cat, esp. a female one, of variegated black, yellow, and white coloring. Also called *tor-toise-shell cat*.

cal/i-co clam, any marine bivalve mollusk of the genus *Macrocalista*, esp. *M. nimbosa*, having a smooth, thick, rounded shell marked with violet-brown or like spots or streaks.

cal/i-co crab. See *lady crab*.

MONTHS OF PRINCIPAL CALENDARS

| Gregorian | | Jewish | | Muslim | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Month | Number of Days | Month | Number of Days | Month | Number of Days |
| January | 31 | Tishri ¹ | 30 | Moharram | 30 |
| February | 28 | Heshvan | 29 | Safar | 29 |
| (in leap years: 29) | | (in some years: 30) | | | |
| March | 31 | Kislev | 29 | Rabi I | 30 |
| | | (in some years: 30) | | | |
| April | 30 | Tevet | 29 | Rabi II | 29 |
| May | 31 | Shevat | 30 | Jumada I | 30 |
| June | 30 | Adar ² | 29 | Jumada II | 29 |
| | | (in leap years: 30) | | | |
| July | 31 | Nisan ³ | 30 | Rajab | 30 |
| August | 31 | | 30 | | |
| September | 30 | | | | |
| October | 31 | | | | |
| November | 30 | | | | |
| December | 31 | | | | |

¹The beginning of

²In leap years Adar

³The beginning of

CONCISE ETYMOLOGY KEY: <, descended or borrowed from; >, whence; b, blend of; blended; c, cognate with; cf., compare; deriv., derivative; equiv., equivalent; imit., imitative; obl., oblique; r., replacing; s., stem; sp., spelling, spelled; resp., respelling, respelled; trans., translation; ? , origin unknown; * , unattested; † , probably earlier than. See the full key inside the front cover.

Acknowledgments and Permissions

The "A Dictionary of the English Language" section of this book (*Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary*) is based on the second edition of *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, the Unabridged Edition*, copyright 1993, 1987.

First published in 2001 by
Thunder Bay Press

An imprint of the Advantage Publishers Group
5880 Oberlin Drive, San Diego, CA 92121-4794
www.advantagebooksonline.com

Copyright © 1996 by Random House Value Publishing, Inc.

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American
Copyright Conventions.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

All notations of errors or omissions should be addressed to Thunder Bay Press, editorial department, at the above address. All other correspondence (author inquires, permissions) concerning the content of this book should be addressed to Random House Value Publishing, a division of Random House, Inc. 280 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017.
<http://www.randomhouse.com/>

ISBN 1-57145-691-0

Printed and bound in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5